

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated March 21, 2007. Claims 26-65 are currently pending. Claims 26 and 31 have been amended. New matter has not been added with the amendments to the claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 26, 27, 29, 30, 42-45, 47-49, 51, 58-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,781,909 to Logan et al. ("Logan"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the Logan reference.

The Logan reference teaches receiving a URL request and searching a transition control list to determine if the received URL request contains a URL that matches a trailing URL on the list, and if so, first displaying the page identified by the URL in the leading field (Logan, column 26-31). The Logan reference also teaches inserting a sequence of leading pages prior to the trailing page identified in the original link (Logan, column 10, lines 1-3). Furthermore, Logan teaches, when a leading URL is not specified, displaying a page from a collection of available pages randomly or by cycling through a list of insertable display page URLs (Logan, column 9, lines 50-52).

Claim 26 recites, in part, "determining if each page identified in the rotation set is stored in a cache associated with the display device" and "sending at least one request for pages identified in the rotation set that are not stored in the cache to a remote server." The Office Action states that the Logan reference teaches these features at column 6, line 36; however, the cited portion of the Logan reference merely teaches that when a user touches a displayed link on a kiosk touchscreen, a request is issued and then the access mechanism retrieves URLs in the request from remote servers using TCP/IP software, when the URL identifies information stored on remote servers (Logan, column 6, lines 11-14, 26-36). Thus, the Logan reference does not teach determining if each page identified in a rotation set is stored in a cache associated with a display device and sending at least one request for pages identified in a rotation set that are not

stored in a cache to a remote server. Instead, the Logan reference teaches retrieving a URL requested by a user from a remote server. Accordingly, claim 26 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Independent claim 42 recites limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitations of claim 26 discussed above. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claim 26, claim 42 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 28 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2002/0078134 to Stone et al. ("Stone"). Claims 28 and 46 depend on claims 26 and 42, respectively. For at least the reasons previously mentioned in connection with claims 26 and 42, the Logan reference does not teach all the features of the claims. The Stone reference fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Logan reference. Accordingly, claims 26 and 42 and their corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 31, 32, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2002/0046299 to Lefebvre et al. ("Lefebvre") in further view of Logan and U.S. Patent No. 6,311,187 to Jeyaraman et al. ("Jeyaraman"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the cited art.

Claim 31 recites limitations similar to the limitations in independent claim 26. In particular, claim 31 recites, in part, at least one display device adapted to "determine if each page identified in the rotation set is stored in a cache associated with the display device" and "send at least one request for pages identified in the rotation set that are not stored in the cache to at least one server." As stated in the Office Action the Lefebvre reference does not teach these features of the claim (Office Action, page 12). In addition, for at least the reasons previously mentioned in connection with claim 26, the Logan reference does not teach this feature of the claim. The

Jeyaraman reference also fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Lefebber and the Logan references. Accordingly, claim 31 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 33, 34, 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lefebber, Logan, and Jeyaraman in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2003/0084124 to Su et al. ("Su"). Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lefebber, Logan, and Jeyarman in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2003/0005129 to Sheinkman ("Sheinkman"). Claim 38 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lefebber, Logan, and Jeyaraman in further view of SearchSecurity.com, pages 1-3, published Oct. 5, 2000 ("SearchSecurity.com"). Claim 40 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lefebber and Jeyaraman in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2004/0039776 to Ballard ("Ballard").

Claims 33-38, 40, and 41 depend on claim 31. For at least the reasons mentioned in conjunction with claim 31, the Lefebber, the Logan, and the Jeyaraman references do not teach all the features of the claim. The Su reference, the Sheinkman reference, the SearchSecurity.com reference, and the Ballard reference fail to rectify the deficiencies of the Lefebber, the Logan, and the Jeyaraman references. Accordingly, claim 31 and its dependent claims 33-38, 40 and 41 are allowable over the cited art.

Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2002/0016839 to Smith et al. ("Smith"). Claims 52, 53, 55 and 63-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in further view of Lefebber. Claims 56 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan and Ballard in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,985,950 to Hanson et al. ("Hanson"). Claims 61 and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in further view of Ballard.

Claims 50, 52, 53, 55-57, and 61-65 depend on claim 26. For at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 26, the Logan reference does not teach all the features of the

Applicant : Daivid J. Morgan, et al.
Serial No. : 10/675,593
Filed : September 30, 2003
Page : 15 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 14012-052001 / 50-02-056

claim. In addition, the Smith reference, the Lefeber reference, the Ballard reference, and the Hanson reference fail to rectify the deficiencies of the Logan reference. Accordingly, claim 26 and its dependent claims 50, 52, 53, 55-57, and 61-65 are allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any fees or credits due to Deposit Account No. 05-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 21, 2007

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/

Elizabeth Philip Dahm

Reg. No. 51,352

PTO Customer No. 26230

Fish & Richardson P.C.

1717 Main Street

Suite 5000

Dallas, Texas 75201

Telephone: (214) 760-6119

Facsimile: (214) 747-2091